

REMARKS

The amendments to claims 1- 4 are grammatical and idiomatic in nature, and therefore do not involve new matter.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons:

1. Rejection of Claims 1 and 4 Under 35 USC §102(e) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,856,506 (Doherty)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Doherty patent does not disclose or suggest a lock, as recited in claim 1, for locking a portable computer to a docking station, much less one that is situated inside and that protrudes from a support arm of the docking station, and that is received in a hole in a portable computer to lock the portable computer to the docking station, as also recited in claim 1.

According to the Examiner, elements 235 of Doherty correspond to the claimed lock. However, elements 235 of Doherty are actually clips that can be slid up and down in tracks 236 to adjust the angle of the metal frame 212. They do not protrude from the support and are not received in a lock hole in a portable computer, as claimed. To the contrary, they are actually attached to section 232 of the case, section 232 being a flap position to the rear of metal frame 212. As explained in col. 14, lines 44 of the Doherty patent:

...Section 232 of the upper portion of the case contains one or more tabs 235 which may be repositioned in tracks 236 to adjust the angle θ of metal frame 212. Clips 234 move along track 236, and may fasten to tab 235 to lock the tab in place.

Thus, it can be seen that tabs 235 have nothing to do with the claimed lock, which protrudes from inside a docking station support arm, and which is received in a hold in a portable computer to lock the portable computer to the docking station. Tabs 235 of Doherty are not positioned inside a support arm, and serve no locking function. Clips 234 of Doherty serve to lock clips 235 in place, but also do not serve to lock a portable computer to a docking station. In fact, the structure

that includes clips 235 of Doherty is not even a docking station, but rather is a carrying case, as is clear from Figs. 13A and 13B of the Doherty patent.

Since the Doherty patent does not disclose any sort of lock that even remotely resembles the claimed lock, *i.e.*, that protrudes from a support arm of a docking station and is received in a hole in a portable computer to lock the portable computer to the docking station, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 4 under 35 USC §102(e) is respectfully requested.

2. Rejection of Claim 2 Under 35 USC §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,856,506 (Doherty) and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0033033 (Hasegawa)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Hasegawa publication, like the Doherty patent, does not disclose or suggest a lock, as claimed, for locking a portable computer to a docking station. Instead, Hasegawa discloses a locking shift lever for an automobile, which has nothing to do with locking of a portable computer to a docking station, and which is clearly not applicable to the portable computer of Doherty since the computer arrangement of Doherty does not include either a lock or a shift lever that needs to be locked.

Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 2 under 35 USC §103(a) is improper and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

3. Rejection of Claim 3 Under 35 USC §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent Nos. 6,856,506 (Doherty) and 5,645,261 (Glynn)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Glynn patent, like the Doherty patent, does not disclose or suggest a lock, as claimed, for locking a portable computer to a docking station. Instead, Glynn discloses an arrangement in which, when a portable computer is inserted into a lid of a securing device, and the lid is closed and locked, the computer is locked to the securing device. The device of Glynn does not lock a computer to a docking station, and the lock of Glynn is nowhere near “inside” and protruding from a support arm of the locking station to be received in a hole in the portable computer to be locked (Glynn specifically provides for locking without providing a hole in the device to be locked).

Serial Number 10/750,770

Since neither the Doherty patent nor the Glynn patent discloses or suggests, whether considered individually or in any reasonable combination, a portable computer locking device of the type claimed, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 3 under 35 USC §103(a) is improper and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Having thus overcome each of the rejections made in the Official Action, expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC



By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA
Registration No. 33,805

Date: December 20, 2005

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone: (703) 683-0500

NWB:S:\Producer\ben\Pending Q...\ZW\WANG 750770\w01.wpd